language or the substantively similar language has been public for many, many months now.

I also want to stress that we are not making permanent changes to laws and Congress can always act again. The CARES Act already made these facilities temporary. They were supposed to end at the end of the year, and, of course, no change in law is ever permanent. Any future Congress can change it.

Back in March, when this crisis hit, the Fed and Treasury knew that they needed to come to Congress for the tools to solve it. They came to Congress, and we turned around in an extraordinarily rapid fashion these massive new facilities that had never been imagined before. We responded quickly. And if there is some kind of future event that calls for a future set of facilities of this particular sort, they can come back to Congress.

There are three facilities—three facilities that were launched in conjunction with the CARES Act, funded by the CARES Act, and I am saying that they have achieved their purpose. They should come to an end. They should not be restarted, and a replica should not be created. That is all.

Some have suggested that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve has some opinion on this. I would challenge anyone to find a statement in the public record that he has made in criticism of this. He is very well aware of what is going on.

The last point I want to make: Some on the other side have suggested that our language may be too broad, and maybe it captures potential facilities that shouldn't be captured. If that is the sincere concern of my colleagues on the other side, I urge them to give me a call. It is very easy to track me down. If you have an objection to the way we have worded this and you want language that is narrower, I am all ears. We can work this out.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON THE DIETZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Dietz nomination?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and navs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

PERDUE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Ex.]

YEAS-51

Alexander	Grassley	Roberts
Barrasso	Hassan	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kelly	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sinema
Collins	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Whitehouse
Gardner	Moran	Wicker
Graham	Murkowski	Young

NAYS-36

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Udall
Duckworth	Murphy	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING-13

Blunt	Fischer	Portman
Burr	Harris	Risch
Cruz	Loeffler	Rounds
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute on the next vote and the nomination to be FCC IG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN CHASE JOHNSON

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the FCC is one of the most important independent agencies that we are counting on for the future of the information age. When you think about the fact that they regulate interstate commerce, radio, television, wire, and satellite in all 50 States, it is imperative—imperative—that we have someone as the IG who understands these policies.

I believe the next era of telecom is going to usher in 5G. I do think we are going to solve our rural IT problems. I do think we are going to connect schools. But if we have an IG who does not understand communication policy, has no experience in communication policy, has never had a role in that, I say we won't accomplish the mission of oversight or the mission, ultimately, at the FCC.

It is clear we don't all agree. It is clear we don't all agree. You got a

nominee last week; I didn't spend all my time talking about why we opposed them. There was no debate.

But when it comes to an IG, we have to get on the same page. We need an IG we can believe in. So I ask my colleagues to turn down this nomination and get us someone who has a depth of experience we all can believe in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on this nomination for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, Chase Johnson is the nominee here. This is a cloture vote. He is a marine. He is a Marine Reserve veteran. He is an accomplished attorney. He was reported from the Commerce Committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote. The distinguished ranking member who just spoke made the motion that Chase Johnson be reported.

We are the victim this afternoon of some absences. We are also the victim this afternoon of some discussion and some differences that have arisen over extraneous issues, and I would just urge my colleagues, both on and off the committee, to remember that this was a unanimous vote out of the committee.

This is an outstanding candidate, and he deserves to be confirmed. With that, I ask for a yes vote.

And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows: $\frac{\text{CLOTURE MOTION}}{\text{CLOTURE MOTION}}$

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Chase Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be Inspector General, Federal Communications Commission. (New Position)

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Rick Scott, Tom Cotton, Mike Crapo, Cory Gardner, Ron Johnson, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Mike Braun, Pat Roberts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John Chase Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be Inspector General, Federal Communications Commission (New Position), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.